

1 ROBERT J. CALDWELL
2 Nevada Bar No. 007637
3 WILLIAM D. SCHULLER
4 Nevada Bar No. 011271
5 **KOLESAR & LEATHAM**
6 400 South Rampart Boulevard, Suite 400
7 Las Vegas, Nevada 89145
8 Telephone: (702) 362-7800
9 Facsimile: (702) 362-9472
10 E-Mail: rcaldwell@klnevada.com
11 wschuller@klnevada.com

12 TIFFANY R. THOMAS
13 Admitted *Pro Hac Vice*
14 **REED SMITH LLP**
15 101 Second Street, Suite 1800
16 San Francisco, California 94105-3659
17 Telephone: (415) 543-8700
18 Facsimile: (415) 391-8269
19 Email: tthomas@reedsmith.com

20 JULIA Y. TRANKIEM
21 Admitted *Pro Hac Vice*
22 **REED SMITH LLP**
23 355 South Grand Avenue, Suite 2900
24 Los Angeles, California 90071-1514
25 Telephone: (213) 457-8000
26 Facsimile: (213) 457-8080
27 Email: jtrankiem@reedsmith.com

28 Attorneys for Defendant,
UNITED AIRLINES, INC.

REED SMITH LLP
A limited liability partnership formed in the State of Delaware

18 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**

19 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

20 THEODORE PAVLIK, an individual,
21 Plaintiff,

No.: 2:15-CV-00885-APG-PAL

22 vs.
23 UNITED AIRLINES, INC., a foreign corporation;
24 DOES 1 through 10 inclusive; and ROES
25 CORPORATIONS/ENTITIES 1 through 10
26 inclusive,
27
28 Defendants.

**STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED]
ORDER TO STAY REQUIREMENTS OF
FED. R. CIV. PROC. 26**

1 Plaintiff Theodore Pavlik and Defendant United Airlines, Inc., by and through its undersigned
2 counsel, stipulate to, and request, an order staying discovery and staying compliance with Rule 26 of the
3 Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and Local Rule 26-1. The grounds for this stipulation are set forth below.

4 The power to stay discovery proceedings “is an incident of the well recognized power inherent in
5 every court to control the disposition of the causes on its docket with economy of time and effort for itself,
6 for counsel, and for litigants.” *Landis v. North American Co.*, 299 U.S. 248, 254 (1936); *Stern v. United*
7 *States*, 563 F. Supp. 484, 489 (D. Nev. 1983) (“Every court has the inherent power to stay causes on its
8 docket with a view to avoiding duplicative litigation, inconsistent results, and waste of effort by itself, the
9 litigants and counsel”). A district court has wide latitude in controlling discovery, and its rulings will not be
10 overturned in the absence of clear abuse of discretion. *Volk v. D.A. Davidson & Co.*, 816 F.2d 1406, 1416-
11 17 (9th Cir. 1987). Common examples of situations in which a motion to dismiss may warrant a stay of
12 discovery include when the motion raises jurisdiction, venue, or immunity as a preliminary issue to be
13 decided. *See Twin Cities Fire Ins. Co. v. Employers Ins. of Wasau*, 124 F.R.D. 652, 653 (D. Nev. 1989).

14 Rule 26(f) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and Local Rule 26-1 require parties to confer
15 regarding discovery to develop a discovery plan and scheduling order after a defendant answers a
16 complaint or otherwise appears in the action. Defendant has appeared in this action. However, the Court is
17 confronted with threshold questions as to the appropriate or most suitable forum in which this case should
18 be litigated. Currently pending, but not fully briefed, before the Court are: (1) Defendant’s Motion to
19 Dismiss (#10); and (2) Defendant’s Motion to Transfer Venue (#12). As explained in the Motion to
20 Transfer, Defendant argues that this case should be litigated in the Central District of California. The Court
21 granted Plaintiff an extension of briefing dates relative to these motions such that briefing will not be
22 complete until the end of July. Until the Motion to Transfer is decided such that this Court determines the
23 appropriate forum for this case, all parties agree that it would not be economical, efficient, or wise to
24 commence Rule 26 procedures and obligations as well as discovery in general. After the Court decides,
25 and the parties thereby know, in which forum this case will be litigated, the parties can address Rule 26 and
26 discovery issues in accordance with the applicable forum’s rules. Accordingly, the parties request that the
27 Court order a stay of discovery and stay of compliance with Fed. R. Civ. P. 26 and LR 26-1 pending the
28 Court’s rulings on the Motion to Dismiss and Motion to Transfer.

1 The parties further stipulate and agree that the stay shall terminate after the Court renders its
2 decisions on the pending motions, and the Parties will conduct the conference mandated by Rule 26(f) and
3 Local Rule 26-1 within fourteen (14) days thereof.

4 Dated: July 9, 2015

Dated: July 9, 2015

5 **ESTEBAN-TRINIDAD LAW, P.C.**

REED SMITH LLP

6 /s/ M. Lani Esteban-Trinidad
7 M. LANI ESTEBAN-TRINIDAD, ESQ.
4315 N. Rancho Drive, Ste. 110
8 Las Vegas, Nevada 89130
Telephone: (702) 736-5297
9 Fax: (702) 736-5299

/s/ Julia Y. Trankiem
TIFFANY RENEE THOMAS, ESQ.
JULIA Y. TRANKIEM, ESQ.

10 Attorney for Plaintiff,
11 THEODORE PAVLIK

and

12 WILLIAM D. SCHULLER, ESQ.
ROBERT J. CALDWELL, ESQ.
KOLESAR & LEATHAM

13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Attorneys for Defendant,
UNITED AIRLINES, INC.

[PROPOSED] ORDER

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: July 14, 2015.


UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

Respectfully submitted by:

JULIA Y. TRANKIEM
Admitted *Pro Hac Vice*
REED SMITH LLP
355 South Grand Avenue, Suite 2900
Los Angeles, California 90071-1514
Telephone: (213) 457-8000
Facsimile: (213) 457-8080
Email: jtrankiem@reedsSmith.com

Attorneys for Defendant,
UNITED AIRLINES, INC.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I am an employee of Reed Smith LLP and that on the 9th day of July, 2015, I caused to be served a true and correct copy of the foregoing **STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER TO STAY REQUIREMENTS OF FED. R. CIV. PROC. 26** in the following manner:

(ELECTRONIC SERVICE) Pursuant to Rule 5-4 of the Local Rules of Civil Practice of the United States District Court for the District of Nevada, the above-referenced document was electronically filed on the date hereof and served through the Notice of Electronic Filing automatically generated by that Court's facilities.


An employee of Reed Smith LLP

REED SMITH LLP
A limited liability partnership formed in the State of Delaware